A. interpretation: the negative cannot give themselves access to [or actually read] new warrants for RVIs bad in the 2nr.

B. violation:

C. standards:

1. strategy skew – aff doesn’t know how much time to allocate on the RVI debate in the 1ar because the neg can just dump new answers if it’s under-covered. leads to skew for the time crunched 1ar since I need to win both the RVI debate and substance even though you can commit 6 min to whichever layer I undercover. AC RVI arguments don't solve – you still have a 13:10 time advantage in developing offense to the RVI debate.

2. resolvability – new args on theory paradigm issues in the 2nr and 2ar become muddled since neither side gets a chance to impact a conceded warrant – means my interp forces the RVI debate to start earlier if the neg wants to initiate theory (in the 1n) which prevents late rebuttal intervention. K2 fairness since arbitrary or irresolvable rounds take the decision away from who did the better debating and thus are damaging for both sides.

A. interpretation: the aff must specify the conditions under which the RVI can be triggered in the text of the AC if there is an aff gets RVI’s spike. For example, “I meets or a counter-interp” trigger the RVI. [other possible conditions: drop the argument or case triggering RVI, reasonability enough to trigger RVI, T or theory triggering the RVI etc.]

B. violation - he/she just says aff gets RVI’s without specifying

C. standards

1) scope of ground - RVI good/bad warrants differ based on what kind of arguments are enough to justify or de-justify the RVI - i.e. reciprocity differs based on whether you can access the RVI via an I meet - this is key to fairness since it skews the ability for me to contest the RVI or to resolve competing claims. This outweighs other links into fairness and education since even if it’s good for RVI’s to not have texts, the judge can never resolve when to use the RVI in the first place.

2) stable implications - absent specification of these conditions you can choose whether to go for the RVI based on my 1NC strategy - for example if I have an interp that’s easy to meet and you want to collapse on the RVI, you can say only I meets trigger RVI’s vs. you winning the counter-interp. This kills fairness since your 1ar can shift the implication depending on what’s most strategic on theory. RVI’s are arguments which question the theoretical legitimacy of interps and establish new win conditions, so they should have explicit texts like any theory shell.  Else we have nothing explicit to reference throughout the round. Stable implications are key since they ensure the relevancy of my arguments on theory. And this outweighs since I can never contest your implications in late rebuttals when most RVI debates become relevant.

AND, this shell always comes first since abuse on engaging the theory debate always implicates the ballot - means the strategy skew is comparatively worse than individual substantive arguments - RVI abuse is worst kind of theory abuse since the introduction of an RVI means the ballot automatically collapses to that layer.

A. Interpretation: Debaters can only claim RVIs if they win offense to a counter-interp, not if they win an I meet on theory.

B. Violation:

C. Standards:

1. Reciprocity:

a) You skew qualitative reciprocity since it’s always comparatively easier to prove that you meet an interpretation than to win offense on the theory debate – especially true since you can easily generate I meets on both the logic and semantics of an interpretation, which gives you a massive edge in engaging the theory debate.

b) Also kill quantitative reciprocity since you get multiple outs on the theory debate – you can generate infinite numbers of sketchy I meets and win a counter-interp as well – each one of them becomes a no-risk issue while I have to win the original shell and beat back everything – especially bad since it allows worse interpretations to propagate because you have so many ways to win and chills legitimate theory, skewing substance as well.

c) Really bad for education since you force the debate to focus on theory since you win on I-meets whereas in my world if you meet my interpretation we can go to substance and learn more about the topic – no reason why I meets are key ground for you since I obviously skewered my own chances if I read a theory interp you met. [It definitely overcompensates since I’ll always spend way more time reading a full shell than you will reading I meets, so I’ve already lost out without further punishment.]

Reciprocity is key since equity is the basis of competition. Strategy skew on theory is always the worst kind since it always implicates the ballot, especially in the case of an RVI – also means drop the arg isn’t enough if you altered ballot. [Finally the logic of your interp literally collapses debate – no one says I win by showing a turn doesn’t link, but you claim a no-link on a shell is game-over.]